

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 15 2006

REMARKS

Claims 16-35 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-15, which stand rejected upon informalities and prior art grounds, are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 16-35 are added herein. Moreover, the abstract is amended. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The Objection to the Specification

The abstract is objected to because the Office Action indicates it is the same as claim 1. Accordingly, the abstract has been amended. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections.

II. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. However, claims 1-15 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

III. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCollum et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0091640 A1), hereinafter referred to as "McCollum," in view of Nikander, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,321 B1), hereinafter referred to as "Nikander" and in view of Hatton (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,356). However, claims 1-15 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

10/729,813

8

The Applicant submits that the prior art references, either alone, or in combination with one another do not teach a system or automated method for interpreting codified provisions comprising "inquiring whether an occurrence of an event has a correct predetermined code associated therewith based on provisions provided in a document; selecting logic rules to apply to said occurrence of said event; evaluating said logic rules in order to select said correct predetermined code; identifying said correct predetermined code based on the evaluations of said logic rules; and providing a user with calculated results comprising the identified correct predetermined code and said provisions provided in said document corresponding to said correct predetermined code" as generally provided in independent claims 16, 23, and 30.

The use of the term "code" in Nikander is non-analogous to the Applicant's use of the term. Filter codes for Nikander are formal specifications of network packets expressed in policies. They are processed on incoming packets and have straightforward interpretations based on policies. In the Applicant's sense, codes are classification code used for classifying said provisions provided in a document. For example, the document may comprise legal documents, business policy statements, contracts, agreements, regulations, rules, constitutions, and codes of conduct. Accordingly, the code associated with these documents may refer to a particular section of the document. The Applicant's specification gives an example of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and various crimes listed thereunder, with each crime having a particular code associated with it (i.e., IPC 299 Culpable Homicide).

Additionally, documents have multiple interpretations while a network filter has a unique specification/ behavior. Thus, while a network filter can be described by a policy, a document cannot be specified by a single rule. This is a significant technical difference between the prior

art and the Applicant's invention because the Applicant's evaluation allows one to control the interpretation from the documents to provide a meaningful result. The uniqueness of the solution is that the Applicant's invention allows false positives in the result (thus allowing redundant rules) but not false negatives (which would mean missing relevant rules in the result). Hence, a combination of McCollum and Nikander would not teach the Applicant's claimed invention. Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

IV. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the objections and rejections to the claims, the claims have been cancelled. With respect to the objection to the abstract, the Applicant respectfully traverses the objection. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims and objection to the abstract.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 16-35, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

10/729,813

10

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/15/06



Mohammad S. Rahman
Registration No. 43,029

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (301) 261-8625
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154